DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 077 EC 302 702

AUTHOR Singer, Ann
TITLE Increasing the Capacity of Regular Education To Serve Students with Learning Problems through Collaboration with the Child Study Team.
PUB DATE 7 Jul 93
NOTE 98p.; Ed.D. Practicum Report, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Checklists; Cooperation; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; Eligibility; Interdisciplinary Approach; Junior High Schools; Junior High School Students; *Learning Problems; Middle Schools; Parent Teacher Cooperation; Peer Teaching; Prereferral Intervention; *Referral; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; Resource Teachers; Teacher Attitudes; *Teamwork; Tutoring
IDENTIFIERS Middle School Students; *Teacher Collaboration

ABSTRACT

This practicum involved the development of a pre-referral intervention approach to increase support for elementary and middle school students with learning problems through the use of Pupil Assistance Committees which designed and monitored strategies for educating students with learning problems in the regular classroom. Pupil Assistance Committees usually consisted of the principal, the learning consultant, the reading specialist, an experienced teacher from regular education, and the referring teacher. An intervention checklist was developed to encourage teachers to try various intervention strategies before referring the student for special education services. Especially effective pre-intervention strategies were parent involvement and peer tutoring. Substantial decreases in the number of referrals were achieved and almost all students referred were found eligible for special services. Increased collaboration between special and regular educators was also achieved. Extensive appendices include additional information on student referrals and classification, interventions used prior to referral, the Pupil Assistance committee referral path, parent notification, pupil assistance procedures, and teacher attitudes. Also attached are various forms used in the program and the intervention checklist. (Contains 29 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 365 077

Increasing the Capacity of Regular Education to Serve Students with Learning Problems Through Collaboration With The Child Study Team

by

Ann Singer

Cluster 44

A Practicum II Report Presented to the
Ed.D Program in Child and Youth Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

NOVA UNIVERSITY

1993

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ann Singer
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 302702

PRACTICUM APPROVAL SHEET

This practicum took place as described.

Verifier _____

Joseph Zondlo

Director of Special Services

Title

Margate City School District

Address

Margate, New Jersey 08402

City and State

July 7, 1993

Date

This practicum report was submitted by Ann C. Singer under the direction of the adviser listed below. It was submitted to the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova University.

APPROVED:

July 7, 1993

Date of Final Approval of Report

Mary Staggs, Ed.D.

Mary Staggs, Ed.D., Advisor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....iii

LIST OF TABLES.....v

ABSTRACT.....vi

Chapter

I INTRODUCTION.....1

Description of Work Setting and Community.....1
Writer's Work Setting and Role.....2

II STUDY OF THE PROBLEM.....6

Problem Description.....6
Problem Documentation.....9
Causative Analysis.....11
Relationship of the Problem to the Literature..14

III ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS.....24

Goals and Expectations.....24
Expected Objectives.....24
Measurement of Outcomes.....27

IV SOLUTION STRATEGY.....29

Discussion and Evaluation of Solutions.....29
Description of Selected Solution.....38
Report of Action Taken.....41

V RESULTS, DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....48

Results.....48
Conclusions.....54
Recommendations.....59
Dissemination.....60

REFERENCES.....62

Appendices Page

A REFERRALS AND CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS....65

B INTERVENTIONS USED IN REGULAR EDUCATION PRIOR TO REFERRAL.....67

C TIME ELAPSED BETWEEN REFERRAL AND EVALUATION.....69

D INTERVENTION CHECKLIST.....71

E PUPIL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE PRE-REFERRAL FORM.....73

F SCHOOL BOARD POLICY PUPIL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE.....78

G INTERVENTION PROCEDURES.....80

H PUPIL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE REFERRAL PATH....82

I PARENT NOTIFICATION LETTER.....84

J ADMINISTRATOR'S PUPIL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE WORKSHEET.....86

K PUPIL ASSISTANCE PROCEDURES.....88

L TEACHER ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS WITH LEARNING PROBLEMS.....90

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	INTERVENTIONS ATTEMPTED PRIOR TO REFERRAL	49
2	TEACHER AND CHILD STUDY TEAM CONTACT BEFORE REFERRAL	51
3	COMPARISON IN THE NUMBER OF REFERRALS TO THE CHILD STUDY TEAM	53

ABSTRACT

Increasing the Capacity of Regular Education to Serve Students with Learning Problems Through Collaboration With the Child Study Team. Singer, Ann, 1993: Practicum Report, Nova University Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies. Collaboration/Handicap Identification/ Learning Disabilities/Multidisciplinary Team/School Resource Committees/ Interventions/Regular Education Initiative/Pupil Assistance Committees/Mainstreaming

This practicum was designed to implement the collaboration of teachers in regular education and members of the Child Study Team. This collaboration will enable teachers to serve students with learning difficulties without having to label those students as disabled. The first objective was that teachers would perceive fewer of their students require a special education. The second objective was to involve teachers in the Child Study Team process before initiating a referral. The third objective was to decrease the number of inappropriate referrals to the Child Study Team.

This writer developed a system that increased support at the building level through Pupil Assistance Committees. These committees consisted of a principal, member of the Child Study Team and a regular education teacher. The group designed and monitored strategies for educating students with learning problems in the regular classroom.

In analyzing the referrals to the Child Study Team, the interventions increased in number and in variety during the school year. The pre-referral contact between members of the Child Study Team and regular education teachers increased dramatically. The actual number of inappropriate referrals decreased significantly.

****

Permission Statement

As a student in the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies, I do (✓) do not ( ) give permission to Nova University to distribute copies of this practicum report on that Nova University will not charge for this dissemination mailing of the materials.

July 7, 1993 — Date

Ann Singer — Signature

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Description of Community

The school district in which this practicum has taken place is in a seashore resort town located on a small island in the Atlantic Ocean. It is a residential town, with homes ranging from $200,000 to several million. This town has experienced a steady decline in "year round" population because property is expensive for a young family and many homes are bought as summer homes by wealthy families from nearby big cities. Today, the community has a year-round population of approximately 10,000 residents which rises to over 100,000 between Memorial Day and Labor Day.

There is little available land in the area. Real estate prices have increased at about the rate of 10% each year and the great majority of people own their homes. There are no apartment complexes or housing projects. There are a number of families who move into homes and motels for the winter months but are forced to find other places to live in the summer. These are the "winter rentals" and comprise the transient students in the school system. There are a few stores and professional offices, a movie theater that opens in the summer, and no shopping malls. Many of the residents work in the casinos located in a nearby resort. Although the casino industry brought many changes in the family structure,

basically most of the students come from stable homes. The community is considered family oriented and wholesome.

The school district consists of two separate school buildings, and an administration building that houses the superintendent, the recreation director, director of special services, and members of the Child Study Team. The two public schools include one that serves preschool through fourth grades and another that serves fifth through eighth grades. In addition the school district is responsible for those children eligible for special services ages 3 through 21, including those who may attend private schools in the city. There are two private schools in the community; a Catholic elementary school with a population of approximately 300 students and a Hebrew Academy, preschool through high school, with a population of about 350 students.

The school setting is quite homogeneous. There are few minority students and no minority teachers or administrators. Previously, teachers had long years of service and never taught in any other school district. Last year, because of a retirement incevtive, many teachers retired and a group of new teachers started in September, 1992. These teachers were distributed almost equally throughout both schools. In addition, there was a new principal in the middle school.

Writer's Work Setting and Role

This practicum was implemented in both schools in the community. The school population has experienced a slow

decline that parallels the community's population. The current enrollment is 276 students in the elementary school and 249 students in the middle schools. Of that population, 71 students are classified as needing a special education. The great majority of the school population is Caucasian, with some Hispanic and a few Black and Asian students. However, the Hispanic population is steadily increasing.

The school system has a full multidisciplinary team, called the Child Study Team (CST) to work with students having special needs. This writer is the state certified learning consultant who, along with the school social worker and the school psychologist, make up the basic CST. In addition, the school system employs two state certified speech and language specialists and two full time nurses. A director of special services, an administrative position, supervises this support personnel. All members of the special services, including the director, hold a master's degree or higher. One of the special services staff members is enrolled in a fully accredited doctoral program.

The faculty is composed of 29 regular education teachers and 4 special education teachers. There are 29 females and 4 males on the faculty. Of this number, all are Caucasian. Seventeen members of the faculty have taught 10 years or more, seven have taught less than 10 years and 10 will be new

will be new teachers to the school this coming school year. There are three classes of each grade, kindergarten through eighth grade. There is also a preschool handicapped class and three resource rooms for special education students. Supplementing the regular teaching staff are: two art teachers, two music teachers, two physical education teachers, three basic skills improvement teachers, a home economics teacher, a shop teacher, and a gifted and talented teacher.

The writer functions as a district-wide learning consultant on the CST. As the learning consultant, this writer has five areas of responsibility.

1. making an assessment and analysis of a child's learning characteristics (strengths and weaknesses);
2. designing instructional strategies and planning educational programs;
3. playing an active role on a multidisciplinary child study team;
4. acting as an education consultant to the classroom teacher and;
5. planning and providing inservice education.

These five components make up the formal facets of this writer's role as the learning consultant. They are the cornerstones of the profession.

This writer holds a Bachelor's Degree in Elementary Education, Master's Degrees in Reading Education and in Learning Disabilities, and post master's training in School

areas: Reading Specialist, Early Childhood Teacher, Elementary Education, Teacher of the Handicapped, Supervision and Curriculum, Learning Disability Teacher-Consultant, and School Psychologist. This writer has completed her 22nd year in education. The past 17 years have been as a learning consultant in the school district. During this time, the writer has been active in school-related programs at the local level. She is a member of the district's Annual Planning Committee for Special Education, coordinator of preschool testing and coordinator for the district's special education curriculum. The writer is a member of the State and County Chapters of the Learning Disabilities Association As a member of the above organization, this writer has written and received several grants for teaching learning disabled individuals.

As the learning consultant, this writer is the only member on the CST who is required to have at least three years of teaching experience in order to be certified by the state. It is this difference that makes the role of the learning consultant so vital. The learning consultant is the professional who has the major input with teachers and parents in establishing programs for children with learning problems.

CHAPTER II

STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

Problem Description

In April, 1992, this writer contacted the director of special services for an interview. During this interview, the writer defined the practicum and asked for some areas in the workplace that could be addressed and improved. The director of special services felt strongly that the greatest problem was the increasing numbers of referrals of students with learning problems to the Child Study Team for full evaluations. Students are often referred by the regular teachers before any interventions or modifications were tried in the classroom. The director was also concerned about the teachers, who are being added to our faculty, becoming knowledgeable about interventions and the referral process.

In our school district, the first step in determining a child's eligibility for special education is through a referral from the regular education teacher or parent Next, the student with suspected disabilities has to be identified through an assessment process to see if there is eligibility for special services. In the writer's community, a multidisciplinary team, called the Child Study Team (CST)

has the responsibility for the assessment and classification of these students. The CST, with other professionals, will prepare an individualized educational program if the student is found needing a special education.

There are several difficulties with the referral process. During the past several years the CST has had a steady increase in referrals for students with learning problems. Many of these referrals were inappropriate and the student was found not classifiable and was not eligible for special services. However, the student still presented learning problems in the classroom which created several unfavorable situations. First, the teacher felt that she/he was not getting services and support for a student that was having learning difficulties. In addition, a lot of time, effort and money was spent in evaluating a student that was not going to be classified.

Secondly, teachers in the regular classroom did not attempt to accommodate students with learning problems. Few, if any, interventions were tried before a student was referred for an evaluation. Classroom teachers referred a student if the student was having any kind of academic problem. If the teacher felt that the student did not "fit in" the teacher referred the student for an evaluation without waiting to see if the student adjusted to the school. Sometimes the classroom teachers were concerned that a child was an underachiever or a "slow learner" and referred a

student to get more information about the student's ability. However, many teachers felt that if a student did not keep up with the rest of the class for any reason, the student was learning disabled and that teacher wanted an evaluation to confirm his/her suspicions.

Finally, members of the CST had little or no input in modifying a student's program before a referral was made by the teacher. Often, the first time the CST was aware that students were having learning problems was after a referral was made from the teacher. Unfortunately, the CST is isolated from the regular education teachers. Members of the CST are physically isolated from the rest of the staff. Their offices are housed in the administration building and not within the schools. They check into their offices each morning, therefore they do not have contact with the teachers in the teacher's room. Many of their professional meetings and parent meetings are held in the administration building. They are itinerant and travel from place to place, not really belonging to a school nor a particular group of teachers. Their schedules do not follow the same time periods as the teachers and they do not meet regularly in the teacher's room or at lunch. They do not have the day to day contact with other members of the faculty that would give an opportunity for communication.

Members of the CST are also isolated from the regular education teachers in their educational background. Many

members of the CST do not come from the ranks of teachers. They are specialists that are required by law to determine eligibility for special education. Therefore, their training is different from most teachers. Many members of the CST did not go to graduate schools in education. Their outlook and even their language is different from the teachers.

Isolation caused several problems. The most pressing problem was that the members of the CST had little or no input in modifying a student's program before that student was referred. Secondly, isolation also gave a feeling of separateness and created a second system whereby the a student is "remediated" or "evaluated" by a specialist and "educated" in the regular classroom without the two systems having a continued and ongoing collaboration. This is not in the best interest of the teacher, the specialist and, most importantly, the student.

Problem Documentation

Evidence of the problem was supported by data from the increased referrals of students to the CST. Evidence that these were problems caused by an increase in referrals to the CST was well documented. The problems were confirmed by reviewing the records that are maintained in the special services department in this writer's school system. These records document any contact or service given to a student as soon as the referral is initiated. The records also include

all information about classified students. This writer found documentation that the number of referrals had steadily increased each year for the past five years (Appendix A). What was revealing was the number of referrals tripled during that time. In the school year 1991-92, out of the 64 students referred, only 43 were eventually classified. One third of the students referred were found ineligible for special services and returned to the regular classroom with no support.

The comparison of the number of students referred and the interventions used prior to referral was also revealing (Appendix B). Of the 64 referrals for the school year 1991-92, less than half of the students's programs were modified or adapted before the referral was made. In addition, the school population declined while the number of referrals increased. This suggested that teachers in the regular classroom perceived more of their students were the responsibility of special education.

Finally, because of the increase in referrals, there was an average of six weeks before a member of the CST responded to a referral (Appendix C). In most cases, referrals were taken on a first come, first serve basis. A full evaluation took a certain amount of time, therefore when there was an increase in referrals there was usually a back-up in services. It is ironic that the more teachers asked for help

from special services in the form of a referral, the longer it took to give those teachers help.

Causative Analysis

There were four causes for the problems of increased referrals from the regular education teachers. First, the eligibility requirements for the classification of learning disabled are very broad, therefore many students can be classified. Other disabilities, such as visually or orthopedically impaired, require stringent criteria to be eligible for special education. The interpretation of classifying a child as learning disabled is quite variable and flexible depending on the state or community that the child resides or even the particular CST that does the evaluation. This was one reason that regular education teachers felt that any student who was having learning problems was learning disabled and needed a special education.

Secondly, regular education and special education operate as two systems, with the responsibility of educating classified students falling on special education, thereby absolving responsibility from the regular teacher. When a student was having learning problems in the classroom, many teachers felt that if the student was classified he would get the help he needed. Teachers believed there would be a special program, with special teachers, so that the student

would be "cured' of any learning problems. Other teachers wanted students referred because classified students did not have to take achievement tests and their grades could be modified. Therefore, the teacher's class average appeared better than it actually was. In both cases the student was out of the class and, in a sense, out of regular education. When students were classified, they were the responsibility of the special education teacher. The regular teacher looked upon that student as "special ed" and no longer felt the ownership of the student as he or she would have done with the other students. Unfortunately, the special education teacher may only see a classified student for one period a day, not enough time to really establish a feeling of ownership with the student. Although, the responsibility for a learning disabled student, who was mainstreamed in the regular classes for some academic subjects, should have been shared between regular and special education, it seldom was. There was little communication between the two systems.

Another cause of increased referrals to the CST was that regular education teachers referred a student with learning difficulties because they were assured direct services from the Child Study Team. A referral started a legal process that guaranteed certain rights. One of those rights was that a student must be evaluated within a certain amount of time, therefore when teachers referred a student they were guaranteed that the student will be assessed within a time

period. Many times, if teachers were having difficulties with a student, they did not contact someone in special services for help. Members in special services were not readily available or a mutual time could not be set-up. This was quite frustrating because teachers needed help right away. With a referral, contact with special services was guaranteed. Teachers knew that a referral would bring a "team approach". There would be a team of professionals that would give input and make recommendations. This was a great support for both teachers and parents. However, it was unfortunate that help was given after the teacher referred a child for the eligibility of special education.

Finally, regular education teachers viewed students with learning problems differently from other students. Many teachers wanted their students to learn in a certain way. If students learned differently than other students, the teacher distinguished them differently. Often, the teacher viewed the student negatively and thought that the student needed special education. They saw the student with learning problems as being different from the other students. They perceived this student as disabled. Teachers referred a student before any modifications or interventions were made in the regular classroom.

Relationship of the Problem in the Literature

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (Public Law, PL 91-142, 1975) is the cornerstone for all educationally handicapped students, including those classified as learning disabled. This law insures that all disabled students be provided a free and appropriate education in the least restrictive environment possible to meet their unique needs. The least restrictive environment provision of PL 94-142 creates a presumption in favor of educating children with disabilities in regular education environments. Placement in the least restrictive environment (LRE) has been discussed and contested in advocacy efforts, professional literature, and in the regulation development process since the law's signing. The statute and implementing regulations require that an educational placement be selected from a continuum of alternatives so that the individually appropriate education can be delivered in the setting that is least removed from the regular education environment and that offers the greatest interaction with children who are not disabled. As a consequence of such federal and state legislation, most students with learning disabilities are integrated in regular educational programs while receiving instruction in special education resource rooms for only part of the school day. In a survey of 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, Danielson & Bellamy (1988) found that nearly three

quarters of all disabled students were served in resource rooms for a part of the day or served in a regular classroom for the entire day. Consequently, the regular education teachers instruct educationally disabled students for a longer period of time than teachers of special education. Many professionals question the need of special education services to learning disabled students that spend so little time in a remedial classroom.

These professionals are calling for an educational reform in special education. This reform is referred to as the regular education initiative (REI). The REI maintains that instructional services for children with disabilities be delivered within the regular classroom environment. The REI addresses the wall between the special and regular or general education systems. The REI is designed to serve students, now in special education, in a common setting with other students with learning problems. The REI was launched by the former US Department of Education Assistant Secretary, Madeleine Will.

Will (1986) outlined specific problems with special education. Will found that the educational approaches were fragmented and there was a "dual system" of special and regular education. This dual system separates special education and lessens the contact between the special and regular classroom teachers. Will stated that labeling students with mild disabilities and segregating them from

regular classrooms result in the students becoming stigmatized. Will also pointed the current practices and battles between parents and school people about placement decisions.

There are additional problems in classifying and programming for children with learning problems. There is the lack of a reliable method to classify a student as learning disabled. Finally, costs for special education services have skyrocketed and the federal and state budgets are finding it difficult to support these services. In view of these findings, there should be changes made in special education to conduct programs wherein efforts are made to serve children who have special needs without labeling them or removing them from regular education.

Special education is organized in rigid categories that are applied to students and programs. In recent years special education has developed an elaborate system to assess and classify students for the purpose of placing them in appropriate programs in either special or general education. Many years ago, the only categories in special education were the blind, the deaf, the severely retarded, the mentally ill and the physically handicapped. However, special education has expanded to include milder handicaps. The prevalence of students classified as learning disabled has increased far beyond the expectation of professionals and projections of policy makers when special education legislation was passed in the mid 1970's. These children were not progressing academically, but did not fit into any other category.

Almost half of the children classified are in the category of learning disabled.

The category of learning disabilities as a classification has many problems. The assessment that is used to determine the eligibility for special education is unreliable and almost any student could be classified as learning disabled by one or more methods used in schools (Ysseldyke, 1987). Across the nation there is an increase of students with learning difficulties who are referred for an in-depth individual assessment to determine eligibility for special education. The current system used by public schools to classify exceptional children does not meet the criteria of reliability, coverage, logical consistency, utility, and acceptance to users. Ysseldyke, Algozzine, & Richey (1982), elaborated on this problem. They state that in order to provide special services, a student must go through a process of referral, evaluation and classification. However, the authors question the criteria that are used in determining whether a student is classified as learning disabled. They state there are 17 operations of the definition of learning disabilities thereby allowing the classification criteria to be very broad and not discriminating. They conducted a study that showed both learning disabled and low achieving students are similarly eligible for classification by using one of the many ways to classify a student as learning disabled.

The assessment process does not determine the kinds of educational programs that would benefit the student. Olson and Midget (1984) went into greater detail about how the classification of learning disabled does not discriminate.

The authors examined the similarity and differences in characteristics of learning disabled students staffed into resource rooms and staffed into self contained programs. After giving each student a battery of tests, the authors found that the results indicated little difference in the overall characteristics between the two groups, so placement in these two settings is arbitrary. This study reaffirms the fact that a basic test battery does not differentiate between those students staffed in self contained classes and those staffed into resource rooms.

Wang, Reynolds & Walberg (1989) discuss the problems of classification even further. They show the category of learning disabilities was created in the 1960's to include students who did not progress in the regular classroom. The authors confirmed that the great majority of students can be classified as learning disabled by one or more methods used in the school systems.

In addition, the authors state that the special education services that a classified student is entitled, show little education benefit. In some cases, special education services provide less instruction than regular education. In a study by Haynes & Jenkins (1986) reading instruction in special education resource room programs for learning disabled students was compared with reading instruction in the regular classrooms for a group of handicapped students and nonhandicapped peers. The results showed that resource room programs were variable in time

scheduled for reading instruction. The time allotted to reading depended more on the philosophy of the school than the needs and characteristics of the learning disabled student. In fact, learning disabled students spent more time on reading and received more teacher directed reading instruction in their regular classrooms This study suggests that special education may not provide uniform education programs.

There is evidence of problems that are created when regular education and special education work as two separate entities. One reason why regular classroom teachers refer children with mild learning problems to special education is that teachers feel that regular education and special education are separate systems. The responsibility of educating classified students falls on special education, thereby absolving responsibility from regular education. Once children are classified, they are unlikely to return to the regular classroom on a full time basis. Semmel (1991) surveyed special and regular educators. That survey found that many regular education teachers believed that full time placement of students with mild learning disabilities in the regular classroom could negatively affect the distribution of instructional classroom time. These teachers felt that the placement of learning disabled students are in direct opposition to the press for academic excellence characterizing the general school reform movement. Jenkins, Pious & Jernell (1990) also found that the classroom teacher is distanced from the special education teacher. Although

there is an assumption that the regular teacher and special education teacher have a partnership in the education of the learning disabled students, nothing could be further from the truth. The authors state that "it is far from easy to visualize an equal partnership between classroom teachers and specialists when the educational setting is the mainstream classroom, where questions about ownership of problems are paramount' (p.485). Communication between specialists and classroom teachers about students and instructional programs is minimal, if not entirely absent. Unfortunately, special educators, in many schools cannot collaborate fully because they are only allowed to serve children who have been classified. This writer is part of a multi-disciplinary team who evaluates and classifies children. In most cases, the first time we hear of a child with academic problems is through a referral from the regular education teacher. The traditional roles of teachers would require redefinition of roles and responsibilities. The role of the specialists, such as remedial reading and learning disability teachers would also be changed if students with mild learning problems would be taught solely in the regular classroom.

Another problem that is caused by two separate systems is that many regular education teachers view students with learning difficulties as different from other students. These students are "special ed" and therefore do not belong with the other students. They feel that classified children

are more different from other classmates than alike. After an extensive review of the research, Reid (1984) concluded that regular classroom teachers associate the label "learning disability" with a negative stereotype. He concludes that LD children have significantly lower social status than their non-handicapped peers. Many teachers feel that classified youngsters are dumb or lazy. Because youngsters with learning disabilities posses a 'hidden handicap' (Kranes, 1980) and may display superior ability in selected subjects, they may be misjudged as lazy or stubborn, especially when their performance is considerably less in other areas. In essence they may be blamed for their handicaps. When teachers and students think that a student is different and doesn't belong, that student may easily develop a social handicap. Prilaman (1982) observed that there was a disproportionately large representation of children who were classified as learning disabled in the isolate category. Parents are very aware that classifying, or labeling will have a negative effect on their children. Many parents do not want their children classified because other children will make fun of them. Students themselves do not want to feel different. It is in the classrooms where friendships are made and if children are taken away from the mainstream for a portion of the day for "special education" instruction, they miss out on social contact with their peers. The more time students spend in special education, the less prepared they are to act and perform like students in the mainstream.

The segregation of special education and regular education is perpetuated by legislation. Leinhardt & Palley (1982) state that legislation specified special money and talent had to be funneled to handicapped students, thereby creating a separate system. For the most part when PL 94-142 was implemented in school systems, general and special educators designed separate programs. Ever since the narrow interpretation that federal aid supplement, not supplant, regular education, special education have favored "pull out " programs. To ensure its supplemental nature, it was felt that separate teachers, texts, and to some extent, facilities, were needed. However, many parents, administrators and special education personnel support special education as a separate system.

The passage of special education legislation brought a host of professionals that were included as part of the special education program. In many states and local districts, program funding is categorical, and financial program support is tied specifically to individual student classification. Many of the supportive and related services are paid through various funding formulas established by state legislators. Mandated services are a very real component of program legislation. Schools had to hire psychologists, social workers, learning consultants, physical therapists, speech therapists, occupational therapists and other professionals. According to Wang, Reynolds and Walberg

(1989) the schools spend an estimated $6,335 per year on each student who receives special education services. The schools spend less than half that amount on students who do not receive these services. Over a thousand dollars a year are spent in just evaluating and classifying students. This is a large sum of money when one considers that it does not go towards the actual instruction of the child. Many school districts are now faced with the problem of trying to serve more special education students under constraints of limited resource allocations.

In view of these findings, the classification process and segregated education of the learning disabled child needs revisions. The costs for special education services should be reviewed. A more valid, and educationally based set of procedures should be investigated.

CHAPTER III

ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Goals and Expectations

There were three major goals projected for this practicum. The first goal was that regular education teachers would successfully serve students with learning difficulties without having to label those students as disabled. The second goal was to involve regular education teachers in the Child Study Team process. The third goal was to implement the collaboration of regular education and special education which was an essential step in solving this problem.

Expected Objectives

The expected outcome of this practicum was that regular education teachers would perceive that fewer of their students require special education services. Teachers in the regular classroom that are familiar with intervention strategies are more likely to keep a student having learning problems in the mainstream. In reviewing the referrals for the school year, 1991-92, only 31 out of 64 referrals noted that interventions and modification were tried by the classroom teacher before the student was

referred. After the practicum implementation, this writer would expect 9 out of 10 of the total number of referrals would indicate that interventions were tried in the classroom before a referral to the CST was made by a teacher. Evidence of these interventions would be demonstrated through an intervention checklist constructed by this writer (Appendix D). The outcome would be that teachers in the regular classroom would be more knowledgeable about intervention techniques, thereby increasing their capacity to serve students with learning problems without labeling the student as handicapped.

A second objective was that the teacher in the regular classroom would have contact, at the building level, with a member of the CST before initiating a referral. The interaction and collaboration of regular education teachers and members of the CST before a referral was essential because it facilitated regular education-special education cooperation. It also afforded teachers and the CST to have an opportunity to support and exchange ideas at the building level before the process of special education was undertaken. Most importantly, it lessened the isolation of the member of the CST. In a review of referrals in the school year 1991-92, there was a six week period from the time the teacher referred a student to the time a member of the CST contacted the teacher and started to evaluate the student. This writer

would expect, after the practicum implementation, most teachers would have contact, at the building level, with a member of the CST before a referral is initiated. The evidence of this increase would be demonstrated through a Pre-Referral Form, constructed by this writer (Appendix E). This form indicates the member of the CST with whom the teacher had contact, the educational difficulties of the student, and the interventions attempted. The expected improvement would be that 9 out of 10 referrals reflect a pre-referral contact with a member of the CST before the referral is initiated.

The third objective, during the school year 1992-93, was a decrease in the number of referrals to the CST. The number of referrals had steadily increased over the past five years. After the practicum implementation, this writer would expect that all teachers increase their awareness in pre-referral interventions and modifications before referring a student. All teachers would have a heightened awareness of students with learning problems and an increased collaboration with the CST. The evidence of increased collaboration would be demonstrated by a reduction in the number of referrals to the CST. The expected improvement was that the number of referrals would be reduced to 50 or less from September 1, 1992 to May 15, 1993.

Measurement of Outcomes

The first objective was that teachers would use interventions before referring a student for a Child Study Team evaluation. This writer measured the attainment of this objective through a checklist that listed possible interventions that were used by the teacher. The Intervention Checklist (Appendix D) was constructed by this writer and was attached to the formal referrals sent to the CST. In May, 1993, all referrals were examined to see if interventions were used in the classroom and nine out of ten referrals indicated that teachers used intervention strategies before referring the student for special education services.

The second objective stipulated that teachers would have contact with a member of the CST before initiating a formal evaluation. In order to measure the collaboration of the teacher and CST before a referral, this writer constructed a Pre-Referral Form (Appendix E). This form was completed cooperatively with the teacher and a member of the CST before a student was discussed at a Pupil Assistance Committee. Evidence of successfully meeting this objective was demonstrated by reviewing the records of the PAC Committee in May, 1993, and ascertaining that, prior to a CST referral, nine out of ten teachers, had contact with a member of the CST.

The third objective stated that referrals would decrease in the school year 1992-93. In order to measure a reduction in referrals, this writer tabulated all the referrals forwarded to the CST from September 1, 1992 to May 15,1993. This data was compared with the total of referrals submitted the previous year (1991-93), There was a substantial reduction in referrals to the CST and the objective was met.

In addition, there was a comparison in the number of students referred and the number of students classified for the school year 1992-93. This comparison indicated a decrease of inappropriate referrals.

CHAPTER IV

SOLUTION STRATEGY

Discussion and Evaluation of Solutions

There was an increase in the referral of students with learning difficulties to the Child Study Team. Classroom teachers suspected that a student had learning disabilities and should be eligible for special education services if that student was having any kind of academic problems. In addition, the members of the Child Study Team were isolated from the regular education teachers and had no input before a referral. In reviewing the referrals, this writer determined that many of the teachers did not try interventions or modifications before referring the student.

In view of these findings, the classification process needed restructuring. A more valid, and educationally based set of procedures needed to be investigated. The pre-referral intervention approach which emphasized the provision of assistance to regular education teachers prior to special education referral represented an avenue that needed to be explored.

Although regular classroom teachers can meet the needs of many children within the regular classroom setting, situations arise when teachers need assistance. In such cases, the classroom teacher often has no place to turn for help. There should be a support system for classroom teachers. This support should consist of problem solving groups that will include both regular and special education personnel within the particular building.

One kind of support might be in strengthening the power of the general education teachers. This includes the development of prereferral alternatives, including providing assistance to general education teachers to strengthen and expand their skills. The supporting research for the pre-referral model is substantial. A survey by Carter & Segal (1989) indicates that most state educational systems recommend a pre-referral intervention model. The study was to determine how many states apply pre-referral intervention strategies and how these procedures are characterized. This study indicated that state educational systems commonly require or recommend some form of the pre-referral intervention model. The study also indicated that the regular educator plays a crucial role in the pre-referral interventions and highlighted the need for increased cooperation and communication between teachers and specialists. The State Register (1992) in this writer's

state proposed that prior to any decision regarding referral of a pupil to a child study team for determination of eligibility for special education programs or services, a certified staff member request the school resource committee to recommend interventions in the regular public school program to address educational problems. There are exceptions to this proposal. Students may be referred directly to the Child Study Team by their parents or if they have severe educational or behavioral problems. Graden, Casey & Christenson (1985), show that interventions reduce referrals, testing, and placement in special education.

Many of the professional associations support the concept of pre-referral interventions. The National Association of School Psychologists (1989), declared in a position statement that attempts should be tried through interventions before referral. These attempts should be in cooperation with regular and special education. NASP affirm that access to special education must be insured for those children who need it, however, they also point out that it is not beneficial to label a child as "handicapped" who is not. The State Association of School Psychologists (1992) also strongly support the concept of a pre-referral committee, however they believe that it is imperative that one of the core members on the pre-referral team be a Child Study Team member. The rationale is that a Child Study Team member has the expertise and must function between several systems such as the family, school and classroom.

In spite of the support of research and professional associations for pre-referral intervention teams, some states have turned down the plan for pupil assistance committees. In this writer's state the State Board of Education (1992) tabled the adoption of pre-referral committees named Pupil Assistance Committees. The State Board was unconvinced that the proposal would not add another level of bureaucracy. Questions were raised about confidentiality of student records and whether such a committee should be mandated at all. The reason that the State Board members tabled the pre-referral committee could be that many parents of classified children were against this proposal. They felt that it would delay services for students with handicaps. They also felt that monies that were earmarked for special services would be funneled into regular education. However, it should be noted that in this particular state, the enrollment in special education has risen by 2,000 children every year in the past decade. Surely, at this rate the federal government and the state would have a financial burden that may prove unmanageable. In addition, are all those children really disabled and do they all need a special and separate education?

The one aspect that the pre-referral committee would insure is the communication between regular education and special services. The committee is made up of three core members--the building principal, a regular teacher, and one

member that is in special services, such as the psychologist, social worker, learning disabilities consultant, speech therapist, guidance counselor, etc. Reynolds, Wang & Walberg (1987) show that one out of six teachers in a building is a specialist and many of these specialists are itinerant who come to the building on a part time basis. They provide services for a specialized program and many times do not consult with the classroom teacher. The "special" staff is isolated from the building staff. One reason that the growing numbers of children with problems are being referred is because of the lack of communication between the staff. A committee that includes both the regular teacher and a specialist would promote consultation. Many teachers refer students in order to get consultative services from a member of the team. Often, there are so many referrals that it takes weeks from the time of referral to the time of consulting with the teacher.

Several prominent groups have endorsed the trend towards consultation and a closer tie between special education and regular education. The most prominent trend is the consulting teacher model (Huefner, 1989). This model has gained attention recently and is being used statewide. The "ultimate goal of the consulting teacher model is to enable the regular education teacher to successfully instruct children with special needs." (Huefner, 1988, p 404). There are several benefits to this model. It may reduce the

labeling of students, reduce the costs of special education and allow more students with learning problems in the regular classroom.

The U.S. Department of Education (1987) appointed a task force to consider the correlation between regular and special education and emphasized the importance of a much closer relationship. Reschly (1987) stressed the importance of developing a system of intervention options and consultation including the Child Study Team rather than the special education placement program that we have now.

Perhaps the most important reform is to ask the question, "What can special services do in the regular education environment to resolve the learning problem?" Consultation services are one way to provide services for problem learners within the regular classroom and increase the effectiveness of related services personnel.

The most appropriate place for consultation is in the pre-evaluation intervention with students referred by teachers due to learning problems. These pre-evaluation interventions can be designed, implemented and evaluated through joint efforts between the special education professionals and members of regular education. This cooperation will enhance the image of all concerned.

The second most important area for consultation is when learning disabled students are mainstreamed in regular

classes for certain subjects. Although it is mandated to place disabled students in the least restrictive environment, sometimes the regular classroom can be restrictive if a disabled student finds the work too difficult. It is important to consult with the mainstream teacher to encourage the teacher to learn techniques that open the mainstream classroom to disabled students. Mainstream teachers' confidence in their ability to handle mainstreamed disabled students could be strengthened through consultation (Understanding the Least Restrictive Environment, 1990). In addition, Shapiro & Margolis (1991) suggest that the learning consultant has a crucial role in helping to enhance the attitude of acceptance in the regular education teachers. Learning disabled students get into the social network found in the regular classes. This helps them make friends and improve their social skills. It is as important to change the attitudes of teachers and the non handicapped students as it is to modify educational programs.

There are always some students for whom special education eligibility evaluations are conducted and staffing meetings have determined the student is not eligible for special education classification and placement. This is a good time to initiate consultation with the regular classroom teacher. However, this is the ideal situation for consultation before the child is referred. A pre-referral committee would prevent unnecessary referrals.

Pre-referral committees and consultations are cost effective. Cost effectiveness of related services personnel and part-time special education programs for the learning disabled have been questioned in recent years. A substantial amount of money is expended determining whether or not students are eligible for programs, and whether they should continue in these programs (Schmuck, 1981). The rate of comprehensive special education eligibility varies considerably, with some school systems reporting a high rate of classifying students while other school systems reporting much lower rates of classifying students (Kratochwill, 1985). Consultation services and pre-evaluation interventions are one way to decrease the high cost, provide services for problem learners within regular education, and increase the effectiveness of related services personnel.

A final consideration concerning cost effectiveness is the fact that, even with high percentages of students classified as learning disabled, there are still many more students within regular education with learning problems. Clearly, learning disability programs and special education for the mildly handicapped cannot serve all problem learners. This again raises questions about the most efficient allocation of resources and the cost effectiveness of various program options.

set to monitor the success, or failure, of the interventions and to establish what was the next course of action with the student.

Many times, the teachers found that they could use a particular intervention, suggested by the committee, with a group of students. The pre-referral committee gave assistance to teachers and increased their capacity to serve at risk students without labeling those students as learning disabled. In addition, the PAC compiled a report at the end of the year that described the needs and issues identified through referrals to the committee. In this way the PAC identified and made recommendations to improve school programs and services.

Secondly, teachers and members of the Child Study Team increased their interaction by having a conference before a formal referral was made. This came as a natural flow of events when a student's performance did not improve after the pre-referral strategies were tried. When a pupil was referred to the PAC and an educationally handicapping condition was indicated, the pupil was then referred directly to the child study team by the committee or parent/guardian. The conference was important at this time to insure that the classroom teacher follow all the procedures of a formal referral to determine the student's eligibility for special education and or related services. Many times a member of the Child Study Team was present when the teacher met with

Description of Selected Solutions

The information on referrals, reviewed for the past five years, showed a need to develop a system that increased the attention of pre-referral support at the building level. This support was given in several ways. First, there were pre-referral committees, called Pupil Assistance Committees (PAC) formed in each school. The PAC designed and monitored the implementation of strategies for educating non-classified pupils who were referred because they were experiencing difficulties in their classes. These committees attempted to resolve the problems of these students by planning and providing appropriate interventions for referred pupils. They also coordinated the access to and the delivery of school services for referred pupils. The committees consisted of the principal, reading specialist, referring teacher and a member of the Child Study Team. Sometimes, the committee was expanded to include other school staff to aid in the process of developing and implementing a pupil assistance plan. After the referring teacher identified the issue which was adversely affecting pupil performance in class or school, the committee collaborated. This committee also coordinated the services of community-based social and health provider agencies. The interventions and modifications were recommended and taken back by the teacher in the regular classroom and tried with the student. Another meeting was

It is now time to reshape PL 94-142 into a new model for the future, a law that focuses less on assessment and procedures and more on the outcome of education. Growing numbers of advocates and parents with children labeled as handicapped are recognizing that the PL 94-142 access to a separate system is not an adequate preparation for a full life. This law should reject the dual system of regular and special education and seek solutions to unify education and educate all students together. There should be a shift in importance from classification to a concern for academic and social learning. This system should be special for all students. States across the land are implementing reform in special education by providing school resource committees and a consultative teaching model. It is clear that special education must change because the Federal government and states cannot afford the exploding numbers of mildly handicapped students. The joining of funding and program services to the categorization of students serves no educational function. Professionals in special education should concentrate in helping teachers and students in regular education instead of continuing the isolation of special education. The model of consultation as a vital role of professionals in special services will demonstrate that special education and regular education can combine and concern itself with solving the problems of all children.

the parent{s} or guardians. Parents often had questions that a member of the Child Study Team was in the best position to answer. This was another way members of the team gave support to the regular teaching staff. It also lessened the isolation of the members of the Child Study Team and created a joint effort with both the regular and special education staff.

The increased involvement between regular and special education revealed that there were a number of teachers that needed guidance in gaining information about working with students with learning problems. Almost one half of the staff in this writer's work setting has been hired within the past three years. The teachers and principals were not versed in the procedures for a pre-referral conference. In addition, the experienced teachers needed a rationale for the newly formed PAC based in their school. A workshop for the entire school staff emphasized the purpose for the establishment of school-based assistance teams and the procedures for referring a student with learning problems (Appendix F).

Lastly, it was essential to enhance the attitude of acceptance of students who learn differently and how that can affect academic performance. This writer contacted a speaker who provided a workshop which was directed at teachers in the regular classroom. The activities simulated what it is to be handicapped and it increased the awareness of how a handicap affected learning.

Report of Action Taken

In reviewing the Special Education Plan during the past five years, the number of referrals to the school system had increased while the number of handicapped students have remained the same (Appendix A). The director of special services suggested that the writer look into solutions to increase the capacity of regular education teachers to serve students with learning difficulties without having to label these students as handicapped. He suggested that the increased collaboration of regular education and special education was an essential step in solving this problem.

The writer met with the superintendent of schools to gain his input and support. The superintendent wanted modifications in the referral process to the Child Study Team. He also suggested that the members of the team be more accessible to the entire staff.

The director of special services, the social worker and this writer, visited other school systems that have pre-referral committees to gather information. This group also went to resource centers, established by the State Department, to research pre-referral committees, collaborative teaching, and learning styles.

A policy was composed for the Board of Education (Appendix F) to include a pre-referral committee. The writer presented this policy to the superintendent and, with his

approval, the policy was introduced and adopted by the Board of Education.

The next step was to meet with the principal in each building for approval of the plans and procedures for the operation of the pre-referral committee in each school. September was quite a hectic month. It was the beginning of school, one principal and half the staff were new to the school system. It was difficult to demonstrate that the newly formed Pupil Assistance Committee was part of the regular education and not an offshoot of special education. The staff relied on special services to handle all academic and behavior problems and referrals were made directly to the Child Study Team. Now teachers would have to try strategies and interventions in their classroom before they could refer at risk students for special education services. In addition to this writer, the reading specialist volunteered to support the PAC. It was important that a member of regular education played such a vital role in forming the PAC because it created a more accepting atmosphere with the other teachers. The hard work paid off and a letter of commendation was written by the director of special services.

In October, a workshop was presented in both schools to inform all school staff about the function of the pre-referral committee (Appendix G). This writer also provided information to the general education teachers on special education rules and eligibility requirements. The workshop

was well received, however the PAC was viewed as a part of special services. Many teachers felt that it was an additional step in referring a student to the Child Study Team. It was not viewed as the responsibility of regular education.

During the next few weeks, the principals selected the standing members of the PAC. As the learning consultant, this writer was a permanent member of the committee at each school. In addition, the reading specialist and an experienced teacher from regular education were also standing members. The referring teacher was a part of the committee. Additional personnel were included on an as need basis. The director of special services allowed this writer to schedule six hours a week to assist with the PAC.

The early PAC meetings met with many stumbling blocks. The problems were more prevalent in the middle school. In the middle school, classes are departmentalized. Instead of one teacher referring a student to the PAC, an entire team of teachers, at a particular grade level, would discuss all of their at risk students. Therefore, it was awkward to arrange a consistent time for everyone to make the meetings. The experienced fifth grade teacher, who was a standing member of the committee, found it difficult to be out of her classroom for such an extended length of time. The principal would call meetings several times a week and they would last at least an hour. Then the principal set up the meetings after school and this brought even more problems in getting the

group together. There were times when everything worked out well and. with a number of students, teachers worked together successfully. These students, normally referred for special services, were handled in the mainstream.

In the elementary school, the situation went smoother. The principal arranged meetings one half hour before school started (with coffee and doughnuts) and only two referrals were discussed. The meetings were always on the same day and at the same time, making it easier to schedule. The difficulty with the elementary school was that the PAC was viewed as a stop-gap for a Child Study Team referral. Most teachers would state as the reason they were requesting assistance was "is the student eligible for special education?"

In order to redirect the focus of the PAC to work within regular education, this writer established a meeting with the referring teachers to assist them in defining problems of at risk students. This writer reviewed the Pre-Referral Form compiled by the referring teacher, pinpointed the learning difficulties of the student, and pre-referral options were examined to ensure trial of alternatives in the regular setting. This writer prepared the PAC Referral Path and developed a specific procedure to schedule a PAC meeting (Appendix H).

The greatest problem that was faced in both schools with PAC was parent involvement. Originally, parents were not notified that their children were being discussed at PAC meetings. The concept behind this was that PAC was part of

regular education and should not have to simulate the rules and regulation of special education. The PAC meetings were to be more informal and collaborative. However, parents objected to not being notified and many of them wanted to be present at the meetings. The committee agreed that parents should be informed about the difficulties their children were having in school and should be a part of the intervention process. Therefore, before teachers referred a student for a PAC meeting, they notified parents in writing (Appendix I). Students referred to the PAC were monitored within six weeks to see if the interventions were successful. The principal would keep a log on each student and would make brief entries describing current status (Appendix J).

The Pupil Assistance Committee now had a structure and form that worked well. This writer, along with the other standing members of the PAC, compiled the procedures for Pupil Assistance (Appendix K) and this document was placed on the bulletin boards around the school.

Many of the students who were reviewed in PAC eventually were referred to the CST. In order to keep track of the interventions that were attempted before the evaluation was processed, the Intervention Checklist was attached to all formal referrals.

The writer planned a workshop that demonstrated ways to enhance the attitude of acceptance of students with learning differences. The committee agreed with the nature

of the workshop because they noticed that many of the students that were referred to the PAC were students that transferred from other school systems. They were "different" from the upper middle class students that comprised the majority of the school population. The workshop was held in February, 1993. The local chapter of the Learning Disabilities Association was contacted and a representative presented a workshop called "Project Accept". The representative presented simulation exercises that gave the feeling of being learning disabled. Materials were distributed and intervention strategies were compiled in a booklet and given to all teachers. This writer composed a survey of Teacher's Attitudes of Students with Learning Problems (Appendix L) and this survey was distributed to all the staff that attended the workshop. After the workshop, the writer requested the teachers review the survey and note if there were any changes in their attitude as a result of the inservice.

The parochial school that our school system services heard about the PAC and requested the director of special services and this writer to give an inservice on interventions and strategies that would assist teachers with students having learning problems. This proved very beneficial because it created new avenues of supporting non-public schools. Previously, the only contact the CST had with the parochial school was through the evaluation process

of a student suspected of having a disability. If the student was classified the only means of remediation was by walking to the public school for special classes. There was a lack of coordination and planning between the two schools and many times little was done after the evaluation was administered. Now, when a student is having difficulty a group of teachers, the principal and this writer meet and discuss possible alternative ways of support. This method brought communication between the public and the non-public schools in the community.

In May, the PAC committee met to compile a report that described the needs identified through pre-referrals. This committee recommended that special education teachers schedule time in the regular classroom to directly support the classified and at risk students. This would replace "pull out" programs for some students. Most importantly, it would establish another bridge for special education and regular education.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Results

There has been a steady increase in the number of referrals of students with learning problems to the Child Study Team for a full evaluation. Students were often referred by teachers in regular education before any modifications were made in the curriculum to accommodate these students. In addition, there are many new teachers on staff who are not experienced in using strategies and interventions with students having learning problems. Because of the increase in referrals, it took a longer period of time before the Child Study Team (CST) responded to the teacher's needs. Therefore, members of the CST had little or no input in modifying a student's program before a referral was made.

The writer developed an Intervention Checklist (Appendix D) and this served as the measuring instrument for objective one. The specific objective, "After practicum implementation, this writer would expect nine out of ten referrals to indicate that teachers use intervention strategies before referring the student for special education services....." was met. The Intervention Checklist was attached to referrals forwarded to the CAT and demonstrated that the objective was met. A total of 41 referrals were

submitted to the CST, in the school year 92-93, and 37 of those referrals had an Intervention Checklist attached. The checklist is part of the collaborative consultation between the teacher and the Pupil Assistance Committee. The purpose of this committee is to support and assist the teacher by providing strategies that will help her/him in keeping a student with learning problems in the classroom. Table 1 compares the interventions used in regular education before a CST referral during the school year 1991-92 with the interventions used during school year, 1992-93.

Table 1 INTERVENTIONS ATTEMPTED PRIOR TO REFERRAL

	1991-92	1992-93
Number of Referrals	64	41
Interventions attempted prior to referral	31	37

The interventions increased in number and in variety during the school year 1992-93. Previously, interventions primarily consisted of changing a student's schedule. If students could not keep up academically in the regular education classroom, they would be scheduled in remedial classes. Very little was done to increase the ways of teaching a student with a learning problem.

This year a variety of interventions were used. One of the most important changes was that teachers enlisted parents as an important part of the solution to help their child in school. The parents in our community are primarily upper middle class and they are quite active in school activities. In addition, the community has a strong interest group which is composed of parents with learning disabled children and this group keeps a watch on the special education services in our school system. When this writer reviewed the Intervention Checklist attached to each referral, it was noted that all of the checklists included working with parents as an intervention. There were three items on the checklist that referred to parents: 1. Work with parents, 2. Give weekly progress reports to parents and 3. Check homework assignments book each night. Parents were quite vocal in the beginning of this project and wanted to be informed at each step of the way. Teachers were careful to notify each parent, in writing, and to include them in the intervention process. One of the most frequent ways of including parents was to have them sign the homework assignment book each night. Not only did it provide an understanding of what the child was required to learn each day, it acted as communication between the parent and the teacher. This made the referral to the CST quite a smooth process because the parents were aware of their child's problem because they were included in the modifications to keep their child in the mainstream.

Another intervention that was used quite frequently was peer tutoring. The school system had several workshops that demonstrated techniques in cooperative learning and it encouraged teachers to group children in ways that facilitated peer teaching. All the interventions listed on the Intervention Checklist were used by teachers throughout the year. This indicates that teachers increased their awareness in teaching strategies.

Objective two stipulated that teachers have contact with a member of the CST before a formal referral was initiated. This objective was measured by reviewing the Pupil Assistance Committee Pre-Referral Form (Appendix E). This checklist was composed cooperatively with the referring teacher and a member of the CST. The specific objective, "the teacher in the regular classroom would have contact, at the building level, with a member of the CST before initiating a referral....." was met. Table 2 demonstrated that nine out of ten referrals reflected contact with a member of the CST before the referral was initiated.

Table 2 TEACHER AND CST CONTACT BEFORE REFERRAL

	1991-92	1992-93
Number of referrals	64	41
Teacher-CST contact before referral	0	37

The second objective was concerned with teachers and members of the CST collaborating before a referral. The interaction of regular education teachers and members of the CST was essential because it facilitated regular education-special education cooperation. There was a dramatic improvement in the collaboration of teachers in the regular classroom and members of the CST during the 1992-93 school year. All referrals, except four, indicated that there was teamwork between teachers and members of the CST. The four referrals that did not have a Pre-Referral Form were referred directly by parents and bypassed the traditional referral path. Previously, there was no contact with a member of the CST until a formal referral was made. In fact, there was an average of 30 days before teachers would have contact with a member of the CST after they referred the student for eligibility for special services (Appendix C). With the advent of the Pupil Assistance Committee, both teacher and member of the CST jointly reviewed the pre-referral form. This served several important functions. First, it insured that the student received interventions in the classroom. More importantly, it gave an opportunity for the member of the CST to exchange ideas with the teacher. When they discussed the student and completed the current functioning portion of the form, they both had a good insight of the

with teachers, the CST had a good knowledge of the students that were experiencing learning problems.

Objective three was measured by comparing the number of referrals forwarded to the CST in the school year 1991-92 (Appendix A), and the school year 1992-93. The specific objective, "The expected improvement is that the number of referrals would be reduced to 50 or less from September 1, 1992 to May 15, 1993, " was met. Table 3 compares the number of referrals forwarded to the CST in the two year period.

Table 3 COMPARISON IN THE NUMBER OF REFERRALS TO THE CST

	1991-92	1992-93
Pupil enrollment	525	527
Handicapped students	71	70
Number of Referrals	64	41
Number of children classified from referrals	48	39

The numbers of referrals have decreased significantly, although the school population and the number of handicapped students have remained stable. For the first time in five years, the number of referrals have decreased. This decrease

could be attributed to the fact that teachers have a heightened awareness of students with learning problems and an increased collaboration with the CST. They have strong support with special services and are able to handle students with learning problems in the classroom. Teachers were not inclined to refer a student unless strategies were attempted and failed.

Another factor that was noted, is that almost all students that were referred to the CST were eligible for special services. The two children that were referred, but not classified, moved from the school district before a determination could be made. This is contrasted with last year's record where 16 children were evaluated and found not eligible for special education. This comparison indicates a decrease in the numbers of inappropriate referrals.

Conclusions

It is important to increase the capacity of regular education teachers to serve students with learning difficulties without having to label those students as disabled. This can be done by increasing the contact between regular education teachers and members of the Child Study Team. The success of integrating students with learning problems in the regular classroom is directly related to the increased collaboration of personnel in the regular education and special education. When collaboration becomes an integral part of the pre-referral process, the teacher

perceives that fewer of their students require special education services.

The first objective concerning the teachers in the regular classroom who are familiar with intervention strategies are more likely to keep a student having learning problems in the mainstream was met as evidenced by the data presented in the Results section. The most frequently used interventions included parent participation and peer tutoring. All referrals, except the four that were initiated by parents directly to the CST, attempted interventions. There was a dramatic increase in the number and variety of interventions attempted.

The second objective concerning the teachers in the regular classroom would have contact, at the building level, with a member of the CST before initiating a referral was also met as evidenced by the data presented in the Results section. Teachers and members of the CST jointly composed the Pre-Referral Form to prepare for the Pupil Assistance Committee. This increased the collaboration of regular education-special education and lessened the isolation of the members of the CST. It also gave the CST a good knowledge of the students with learning problems throughout the school.

The third objective was that there would be a reduction in the number of referrals to the CST. This objective was measured by tallying the number of referrals forwarded to the CST for the past two years and comparing the results. There

was a sharp decline in the referrals for the school year, 1992-93 when compared to the previous year. This decline is attributed to the teacher's increased use in pre-referral interventions and modifications before referring a student to the CST. The collaboration between the members of the CST and teachers was essential in establishing those changes that were made in the classroom to accommodate students with learning problems.

What was even more remarkable, was that all but two referrals resulted in the classification of students as needing special services. The two referrals that were not classified moved from the district before a decision could be made. This indicates a marked decrease of inappropriate referrals.

One unanticipated outcome of this practicum was involvement of the parents. Parents were very concerned with their children's schooling. Initially, this writer did not include parent participation because the Pupil Assistance Committee was not enmeshed with the rules and regulations of special education. The PAC is a regular education initiative and should not imitate the structure of special education. Legally, it was not mandatory to notify the parents of children with learning problems that there would be a meeting to cooperatively initiate strategies to help the child remain in the regular classroom. However, there is a strong

parent interest group and they exerted pressure on the school. The parent group strongly objected to the PAC because they felt that it would delay special services for those children who were learning disabled. They also felt that by delaying classification, children would be denied the rights that PL 94-142 affords. These parents worked long and hard to obtain these rights and they did not want to relinquish them. They advocated that parents refer their child directly to the Child Study Team and bypass the PAC. Four parents did just that. The members in PAC modified the procedures to mollify parents and the parent interest group. Modifications included that parents be notified, in writing, if their child was going to be discussed at a PAC meeting. Parents were informed, after the meeting, what transpired and they were given a copy of the interventions. The parent interest group wanted a parent to be a member of PAC, however this writer felt that the primary goal of PAC was for regular-special education collaboration and not for parent involvement. However, when parents felt they were "partners" with PAC and they were involved with the interventions of their children the relationship with parents was very successful.

Another unexpected outcome was the lack of operational procedures in the middle school when the PAC was initiated. Although, time was taken to establish the rationale of a building based collaborative team, not enough time was

invested in the operational procedures. Actually, time should have been made just to have the team work together. The middle school had many new teachers that needed time just to get used to the routines of their new school. In addition, the principal was also new. He was intent on establishing his leadership skills. Unfortunately, this staff was not comfortable in working together. It did not have the give and take that is needed for successful collaboration. To be successful, the PAC should follow a regular format that members are comfortable and familiar. Fortunately, after a few months, the PAC at the middle school had organization and followed a specific schedule.

In analyzing the data that demonstrated the increased collaboration with teachers in the regular classrooms and members of the CST, one can conclude that the practicum proved to be a good experience for both teachers, members of the CST, and students who are having learning problems. The greatest criteria of success was that teachers perceived that fewer of their students needed special education services. This was because the teachers became familiar with intervention strategies and were more likely to keep diverse students in the mainstream. This was evidenced by the sharp decline in referrals to the CST. Most importantly, after the practicum, there was a "meshing" of all school personnel. No longer was special education the second, and separate, system.

Recommendations

Regular education and special education can have a partnership through collaboration and sharing in decision making opportunities. This can be accomplished through building level committees. This committee would recommend strategies and interventions for students with learning problems before they are labeled as learning disabled. Teachers in the regular classroom that are familiar with intervention strategies are more likely to keep a student in the mainstream.

The isolation of special education can also be reduced through collaboration. This can be accomplished by the teacher in the regular classroom having contact with a member of the Child Study Team before a referral is initiated. This will afford the Child Study Team an opportunity give support before the process of special education is undertaken.

In addition, teachers can have an increased awareness of students with learning problems through a collaboration with the Child Study Team. This increased collaboration will decrease the number of inappropriate referrals.

The results of this practicum and the review of the literature indicate that collaboration is most successful when the needs of regular education, special education, and the community are matched. The success of this practicum was evidenced through Pupil Assistance Committees formed at each building, the collaboration with a member of the Child Study Team member before a referral, and the sharp decrease of referrals for special education services. The following recommendations address the concerns of the parents and the

parent interest groups that initially objected to Pupil Assistance Committees.

1. Before undertaking a regular education reform, such as organizing Pupil Assistance Teams at each school, care must be taken to include parent and parent groups. There should be a variety of communications, such as meetings, newsletters and speakers, to educate parents.

2. Parents should be included to participate in every step of their child's referral to the Pupil Assistance Team. They should be notified that their child is having difficulty, contacted after the PAC meeting, and be included in the strategies and interventions developed for their child.

The following recommendation addresses the organizational planning of committees in the schools.

1. Time should be allotted for members of PAC to work comfortably with one another. Before the core committee acts as a collaborative team, there should be time taken to establish routines and schedules.

Dissemination

Dissemination of the report and abstracts will take place following the approval of the final report, in June 1993, at the Board of Education meeting at the administration building. A copy of this report will be forwarded to the director of special services and the administrators in the school district before the presentation. A copy of this practicum will also be sent to the Director of Special

Education at the Office of Special Education in the State Department of Education. The state is in the process of legislating pupil assistance committees in all schools during the school year, 1993-94. They are currently looking for successful programs throughout the state and they would be interested in this practicum.

REFERENCES

Carter, J., & Segal, G. (1989). Survey on prereferral practices: Responses from state department of education. Exceptional Children, 298-362.

Educating students with learning problems, (1986) Washington, DC: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, US Department of Education.

Ellis, J. (1990), Special education: A statistical report for the 1989-90 school year. New Jersey State Department of Education. 11.

Danielson, L. & Bellamy, T., (1988). State Variation in Placement of Children with Handicaps in Segregated Environments. Office of Special Education Programs, Washington, DC.

Graden, J., Casey, A., & Christenson, S. (1985). Implementing a pre-referral intervention system: Part 1. The model. Exceptional Children, 51 (3) 375-384.

Haynes, M. & Jenkins, R. (1986). Reading instruction in the special education resource rooms. American Education Research Journal 23 (23), 161-190.

Huefner, D. (1988) The counseling teacher model: Risks and opportunities. Exceptional Children, 54(5), 405-414.

Jenkins, J., Pious, C., & Jewell, M. (1990). Special education and regular education initiative. Exceptional Children 56, 479-490.

Kranes, J.E. (1980), The Hidden Handicap New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kratochwill, T., (ed.), (1985). Single subject research; Strategies for evaluating change. New York: Academic Press

Leinhardt, G. & Pallay, A., (1982), Restrictive educational settings; Exile or haven? Review of Educational Research (52) 4 557-578.

NASP-NCAS Position Statement: Advocacy for Appropriate Educational Services for Children (1985) Washington, DC. National Association of School Psychologists-National Coalition of Advocates for Students.

NASP Position Statement: Rights Without Labels (1989) School Psychology Review (18) 4.

New Jersey Register, Monday, April 4, 1992. Proposed Amendments NJAC 6;28-11.5 Referral 1162.

New Jersey School Psychologist Position Paper: Child Study Team Membership in Pupil Assistance Committees (Spring, 1992), 4-5.

Olson, J., & Midgett, J. (1984). Alternative placements: Does a difference exist in the LD population? Journal of Learning Disabilities, 17 (2) 101-103.

Plan for pupil assistance committees tabled, New Jersey Education Review, (April, 1992) .7.

Prillaman, D. (1981). Acceptance of learning disabled students in the mainstream environment: A failure to replicate. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 14, 344-346.

Reid, B. R., (1984), Attitude toward the learning disabled in school and home. In R. L. Jones (ed) Attitude and attitude changes in special education: Theory and practice. 157-170 Reston, Va: Council for Exceptional Children.

Reynolds, M., Wang., & Walberg, H., (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and regular education. Exceptional Children (53) 391-396.

Reschly, D. (1987). Learning characteristics o f mildly handicapped students; Implication for classification, placement, and programming. In M. C. Wang, M. C. Reynonds, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.) The handbook of special education: Research and practice. (Vol. 1-3) Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.

Schmuck, R. & Miles, M., (1981). Organization development in the schools. Palo Alto, CA: National Press Books.

Semmel, M. (1991). Teacher perceptions of the regular education initiative. Exceptional Children, 9-21..

Shapiro, A. & Margolis, H. (1991). Changing negative peer attitudes toward students with learning disabilities. Reading, Writing, and Learning Disabilities, 133-143.

U. S. Department of Education, Interagency Committee on Learning Disabilities, (1987). Learning Disabilities (18), 113.

Wang, M., Reynolds, M. & Walberg, H., (1989), Who benefits from segregation and murky water? Phi Delta Kappan 61-63.

Will, M. (1986) Educating students with learning problems--a shared responsibility. Washington, DC US Department of Education.

Ysseldyke, J. (1987) Classification of handicapped students. In M C Wang, M C Reynolds & H J Walberg (Eds), Handbook of special education; Research and practice. Vol. 1: Learner characteristics and adaptive education. 253-271). New York, Pergamon Press.

Ysseldyke, J., Algozzine, B., & Richey, L., (1982). Judgment under uncertainty: How many children are handicapped? Exceptional Children,, 531-534.

APPENDIX A

REFERRALS AND CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS

REFERRALS AND CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS

1988-1992

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992
Pupil Enrollment	668	612	584	552	525
Handicapped students	71	64	68	70	71
Number of Referrals	21	36	44	53	64
Number of children classified from referrals	18	27	38	43	48

Source: Special Education Plan 1988-1992

APPENDIX B

INTERVENTIONS USED IN REGULAR EDUCATION PRIOR TO REFERRAL

INTERVENTIONS USED IN REGULAR EDUCATION

PRIOR TO REFERRAL

1988-1992

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992
Pupil Enrollment	668	612	584	552	525
Handicapped students	71	64	68	70	71
Number of Referrals	21	36	44	53	64
Interventions attempted prior to referral	*	*	16	24	31

* no information available

Source: Special Education Plan 1988-1992

APPENDIX C

TIME ELAPSED BETWEEN REFERRAL AND EVALUATION

TIME ELAPSED BETWEEN REFERRAL AND EVALUATION

1988-1992

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992
Pupil Enrollment	668	612	584	552	525
Handicapped students	71	64	68	70	71
Number of Referrals	21	36	44	53	64
Time elapsed between referral and evaluation	10days	12days	20days	24days	30days

Source: Special Education Plan 1988-1992

APPENDIX D

INTERVENTION CHECKLIST

INTERVENTION CHECKLIST
PLEASE ATTACH TO THE CHILD STUDY TEAM REFERRAL

NAME OF STUDENT REFERRING TEACHER

PRESENTING PROBLEM

Date

___Tape record difficult material for the student to follow.
___Allow more time for tests
___Use peer tutoring
___Tape directions
___Highlight important words or phrases
___Change student's seat
___Use lower reading level materials
___Reduce work
___Use graph paper for math problems
___Use tracing paper for copying letters
___Reduce distractions
___Provide both verbal and visual directions
___Work with parents
___Tape or read tests and quizzes
___Make reading windows to be put over reading material
___Give only one workbook page at a time
___Outline reading material
___Use computers for students with poor handwriting
___Use contracts and reward systems
___Give weekly progress reports to parents
___Use alternative teaching: slides, videos, field trips, experiments
___Have a peer take notes
___Have student dictate answers on tests
___Provide manipulative to solve math problems
___Check homework assignment book each night
___Provide a quiet place without any distractions
___Provide assignment sheet to students
___Accept alternative forms of information: charts, photo essay, demonstrations

OTHER INTERVENTIONS SUGGESTED BY PUPIL ASSISTANCE TEAM

APPENDIX E

PUPIL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE
PRE-REFERRAL FORM

SCHOOL'S LETTERHEAD
PUPIL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

1. REFERRAL INFORMATION

Name_____ DOB_____

Address_____ Phone_____

Age_____ Grade_____ Teacher_____

Person Requesting Assistance_____

Member of Child Study Team Contacted_____

Briefly discuss why you are requesting assistance

_____

_____

_____

LIST INTERVENTION STRATEGIES ATTEMPTED TO DATE

Parent Conferences __ Assignment Book __ Counseling__

Teacher Mentor __ Peer Coaching __ Tutoring __

Other_____

_____

_____

Describe Parental Response to Student's Progress/Conduct in School:_____

_____

_____

Please attach student work sample if representative of problem.

CURRENT FUNCTIONING Please check each behavior that applies.

MEMORY, ABSTRACTIONS, GENERALIZATION, AND ORGANIZATION

__ Demonstrates organizational skills

__ Demonstrates adequate memory skills, including rote

__ Demonstrates an understanding of abstract concepts
__ Demonstrates an understanding of oral directions
__ Demonstrates adequate visual memory abilities
__ Demonstrates auditory memory abilities
__ Demonstrates an understanding of directionality
__ Demonstrates adequate concentration abilities
__ Demonstrates logical thinking abilities
__ Demonstrates adequate visual perception abilities
__ Demonstrates appropriate working pace

READING

__ Demonstrates comprehension of what is read
__ Demonstrates comprehension of what is read to him/her
__ Demonstrates word attack skills
__ Demonstrates adequate recognition of words on grade level
__ Demonstrates ability to maintain place when reading
__ Demonstrates an understanding of phonic skills
__ Demonstrates word comprehension
__ Demonstrates adequate independent reading skills
__ Demonstrates adequate discrimination of similar words

WRITING

__ Demonstrates ability to carefully execute assignments
__ Demonstrates ability to copy from the chalkboard
__ Demonstrates adequate usage of capitalization
__ Demonstrates appropriate spacing when writing
__ Demonstrates ability to punctuate correctly when writing
__ Demonstrates correct letter formation when writing
__ Demonstrates ability to complete sentences

SPELLING

__ Demonstrates knowledge of and uses spelling rules
__ Demonstrates understanding of phonics in spelling
__ Demonstrates adequate ability to learn spelling words

MATH

__ Demonstrates ability to correctly solve problems using

- __ Addition
- __ Subtraction
- __ Multiplication
- __ Division
- __ Word Problems
- __ Time
- __ Exponents
- __ Borrowing
- __ Carrying
- __ Money

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

__ Works on assignments during class time
__ Does homework
__ Passes tests or quizzes
__ Is prepared for class
__ Performs at ability level
__ Can remain on task
__ Is attentive
__ Completes assignments

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

__ Responds positively to praise or recognition
__ Speaks appropriately to teachers
__ Is accepted by other students
__ Will allow others to take their turn or participate

__ Cares about academic performance
__ Accepts consequences of his/her behavior
__ Accepts responsibility
__ Is motivated by rewards
__ Is able to accept change
__ Is able to move and work with a group
__ Follows directives from teachers
__ Follows the classroom rules
__ Behaves appropriately going to and from school

APPENDIX F

SCHOOL BOARD POLICY
PUPIL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

POLICY TO SCHOOL BOARD
PUPIL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

The (your school district) Board of Education recognizes the importance of the Pupils Assistance Committee (PAC) concept and therefore agrees that such committees should be established within each of the district's schools.

The Board believes that each building can benefit from school-based decision making and that Pupil Assistance Committees can serve as vehicles to develop and design instructional programs through collaborative problem solving. These committees can also enhance existing methods of operation within the schools to assist non-handicapped students with learning problems.

The Core Committee within each building shall be approved by the Superintendent and is to be composed of at least three (3) members. The members shall be the principal (or designee with authority to implement the decisions of the PAC), a member of the Child Study Team, and at least one member of the building's regular education staff who has knowledge of the continuum of services within the building and of the curriculum, as well as good interpersonal skills, so as to effectively serve in such a consultative and supportive role. This Core Committee shall be appointed for the term of one academic year.

In addition to the Core Committee, the teacher seeking assistance will always be part of the PAC. The Chairperson of the PAC will be the building principal or designee, a special education staff member may not serve as designee for the principal

APPENDIX G

INTERVENTION PROCEDURES

INTERVENTION PROCEDURES

THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED WHEN A STUDENT IS EXPERIENCING PROBLEMS WITHIN THE REGULAR EDUCATION PROGRAM.

FOLLOWING THE WORKSHOP, NUMBER THE STATEMENTS IN THE CORRECT ORDER AND IT WILL SPELL A WORD!

___ With collaborative assistance from the Pupil Assistance Committee, the classroom teacher conducts modified teaching interventions for the student.

___ If the problems are not severe in nature, the teacher should contact the PAC to collaborate and implement interventions that would be most appropriate in helping the student.

___ The Intervention Checklist will be developed and implemented according to the goals, objectives and time lines stated, and a decision will be made at the conclusion of the plan on whether or not to refer the child to the Child Study Team.

___ If a child is experiencing <u>severe</u> problems, academically or behaviorally, the teacher should speak to the principal about a direct referral to the Child Study Team.

___ If the procedures outlined are not sufficient to correct the problems, a member of the CST will consult. Documentation of the student's learning performance are used to make a formal referral for assessment and eligibility in special services.

1=H 2=I 3=G 4=R 5=T

APPENDIX H

PUPIL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE REFERRAL PATH

PUPIL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE REFERRAL PATH

Student_____
Referred by_____
Position_____
Parent Letter Mailed _____
Date_____

Suggested PAC Members

Counselor	__	Psychologist	__
Building Administrator	__	Social Worker	__
Referring Teacher	__	LDTC Consultant	__
Team Teachers	__	Speech Therapist	__
Nurse	__	Reading Specialist	__
Physical Therapist	__	BSI Teachers	__
Sp. Ed. Teacher	__	Other	__

The above participants have been contacted and scheduled for a Pupil Assistance Committee meeting on _____at_____to be held in _____.

LDTC Signature_____
Date_____

Forward with the PAC Referral Form to the assigned administrator for meeting date confirmation

Administrator's Receipt_____

APPENDIX I

PARENT NOTIFICATION LETTER

SCHOOL'S LETTERHEAD

Date:

Dear_____,

I am concerned with your child_____'s progress. _____seems to be experiencing difficulties in _____

_____

_____

_____

I have referred your child to (your school's) Pupil Assistance Committee for consultation where we will be discussing possible helpful ideas and strategies. Members of the Committee are trained professionals interested in the difficulties stated above and will be working with your child and conferring with me to develop a plan of action to assist him/her with school success.

I will share the results of this consultation with you. If you have any questions concerning this, please call.

Sincerely,

_____

Principal

APPENDIX J

ADMINISTRATOR'S PUPIL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE WORKSHEET

ADMINISTRATOR'S PAC WORKSHEET

Pupil Assistance Plan

Student:_____ Date:_____

Background Informational Notes:

Proposed in-school, non special education solution
recommended by
the PAC:

Proposed case review date:_____

Review of the non-special solution: Date_____

Professional staff members present:

Is the solution working? yes___ no___

Additional time necessary yes___ no___

Is referral to the Child Study Team indicated at this time?
yes___ no___

PAC Comments:

APPENDIX K

PUPIL ASSISTANCE PROCEDURES

PUPIL ASSISTANCE

Who Should Be Referred?

Those non-classified students who display academic/behavioral problems in the regular classroom.

Steps To Follow:

1. Teacher should talk with student, examine cumulative folder, talk to parent or guardian, try intervention solutions.
2. If condition still persists, send parent contact letter. Make up referral form with learning consultant.

Learning Consultant

1. Review interventions with teacher.
2. Schedule meeting data with principal
3. Notify committee

Administrator

1. Conducts the meeting
2. Schedules follow-up (2-6 weeks)

Meeting Agenda

1. Review previous referrals.
2. Act on new referrals (no more than two new students).
3. Time limit 45 minutes.

APPENDIX L

TEACHER ATTITUDES OF STUDENTS WITH LEARNING PROBLEMS

TEACHER ATTITUDES
OF
STUDENTS WITH LEARNING PROBLEMS

Mark agree or disagree for each statement.

STUDENTS WITH LEARNING PROBLEMS

___ are different from other students.

___ are clumsy and poorly coordinated.

___ could learn if they paid attention.

___ have a right to receive education in the regular classroom.

___ have poor social skills.

___ take up too much of the teacher's time in the regular class.

___ are ridiculed by other children.

___ could learn if they worked harder.

___ have the same characteristics as other children.

___ would increase their achievement levels if they were taught in the regular classroom.

___ are never found in the gifted and talented programs.

___ should be taught in the LRC because they learn differently.

___ are aggressive.

___ are "out in left field" most of the time.

___ would increase their social skills if they were taught in the regular classroom.

COMMENTS